



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/827,405

04/20/2004

So-young Kim

Q80509

2940

23373 7590 10/30/2008  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

WERNER, DAVID N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/30/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/827,405	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KIM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> David N. Werner	<b>Art Unit</b> 2621	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David N. Werner. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Peter McKenna. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 20.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent 5,502,492 A (Jung).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☐ was not reached.    h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Clarification was discussed concerning the statement in page 4 of the 09 October 2008 Advisory Action discussing the difference between the indirect determination of a block mode based on subblock motion vector similarity in the Jung reference and the unclaimed direct determination of the present invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/D. N. W./ Examiner, Art Unit 2621	/Mehrdad Dastouri/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621
---------------------------------------	--